

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-18 were pending in the application. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. Therefore, claims 1 and 3-18 are now pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application is requested for at least the reasons that follow.

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 4, 7, 8, 12, 16 and 18 include allowable subject matter.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 14 are objected to for informalities. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to delete the term “member” and replace the term with “mechanism.” Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9-11, 13-15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,753,322 (“Föhl”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,669,354 (“Lucy”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1

The rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn at least because the references, separately or together, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the elements of claim 1. For example, Föhl and Lucy fail to disclose, teach or suggest “wherein the shock absorbing member includes two compressible members, the second compressible member surrounding the first compressible member,” as recited in claim 1. The Office Action admits that Föhl “does not disclose the shock absorbing mechanism including two compressible members, the second compressible member surrounding the first compressible member.” (Office Action at p. 2, ¶ 4). The Office Action further states that Lucy teaches “hermetically sealed air 38a [which] must be compressed during the compression of member 33a,” and, thus, the sealed air constitutes the second compressible member. (Office Action at p. 3, ¶ 5). However,

Applicants disagree. The sealed area (38a, 38b) of Lucy is not a “compressible member,” as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 3, 5-6, 9-11, 15 and 17 depend from claim 1 and are allowable therewith, for at least the reasons set forth above, without regard to the further patentable limitations set forth in these dependent claims.

Claim 13

The rejection of claim 13 should be withdrawn at least because the references, taken together or separately, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the elements of claim 13. For example, neither Föhl nor Lucy disclose, teach or suggest “wherein the shock absorbing mechanism includes two compressible members positioned around the wire,” as recited in claim 13. As discussed above, the Office Action admits that Föhl fails to disclose two compressible members. (*See* Office Action at p. 2, ¶4). Furthermore, Lucy fails to disclose two compressible members. The sealed area (38a, 38b) of Lucy is not a “compressible member,” as recited in claim 13. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 14

The rejection of claim 14 should be withdrawn at least because the references, taken together or separately, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the elements of claim 14. For example, neither Föhl or Lucy disclose, teach or suggest “wherein the shock absorbing mechanism includes two compressible members, the first compressible member surrounding the second compressible member and wherein the second compressible member includes a relatively rigid portion to limit the movement of the movable member,” as recited in claim 14. Föhl does not disclose two compressible members. (*See* Office Action at p. 2, ¶4). Lucy fails to disclose, teach or suggest two compressible members. The sealed area (38a, 38b) of Lucy is not a “compressible member” and it does not include a “rigid portion,” as recited in claim 14. The sealed area (38a, 38b) is merely air. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Furthermore, the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9-11, 13-15 and 17 should be withdrawn because there is no motivation to combine Föhl and Lucy. Föhl is directed to safety belts. On the contrary, Lucy clearly states that it is directed to release mechanisms and, more specifically, “unlatching lens covers, gimballs, instrumentation covers, etc., on orbiting telescopes, optical instrumentation or other complex and highly sensitive space instrumentation packages.” (Lucy at col. 1, lines 15-20). The Office Action states that Lucy is in an analogous art of “one shot explosion actuated expansible chamber type motor.” (Office Action at p. 2, ¶5). Applicants disagree. Lucy is not in the same field of the present invention or Föhl, and Lucy is not reasonably pertinent to the problem of the present invention. M.P.E.P. 2141.01(a). Lucy is in the field of release mechanisms of “highly sensitive space instrumentation packages” that provide for the objects of a contamination free system, which cannot be installed backward. (See Lucy at col. 1, lines 13-20; col. 2, lines 6-20). Furthermore, a person of ordinary skill seeking to solve problems with seat belt devices would not be reasonably expected or motivated to look to release mechanisms for space instrumentation packages. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of

papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R.
§1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 9/30/2004

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5300
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Howard N. Shipley
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No: 39,370